

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

MIRAE ASSET SECURITIES CO., LTD.

Plaintiff,

V.

RYZE RENEWABLES HOLDINGS, LLC, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-01492-APG-NJK

Order

[Docket Nos. 195, 196]

¹ Pending before the Court is the parties' proposed discovery plan. Docket No. 196.

13 Defendants seek to stay discovery pending resolution of its forthcoming motion to dismiss or
14 abstain. *Id.* at 6. However, this motion has not been filed, *see* Docket, and Defendants fail to
15 address the governing standards for seeking a stay.² The parties have differing views about how
16 this forthcoming motion affects the need and scope of discovery. *Id.* at 4.

17 Accordingly, the proposed discovery plan is **DENIED** without prejudice. Docket No. 196.
18 If Defendants seek relief based on a forthcoming motion, they must file that motion expeditiously.
19 Once they file that motion, they must file, by February 28, 2025, a request addressing the pertinent
20 standards. *See Kor Media Grp., LLC v. Green*, 294 F.R.D. 579, 581 (D. Nev. 2013). If such a
21 request to stay discovery is not filed, the parties must engage in a robust meet-and-confer to craft

¹ The Court expects a high degree of professionalism and civility from attorneys. See Local Rule 1-1(c). As the Court has already made abundantly clear, motions are not to be used to accuse opposing parties of gamesmanship or for mudslinging. See Docket No. 184 at 3. Despite the Court’s previous order, the parties continue to attack each other. See Docket No. 196. These *ad hominem* attacks are distracting, unprofessional, and unnecessary. Attorneys must change their approach to this case and litigate it in an collegial and professional manner.

² It is unclear whether Defendants seek a stay of discovery, Docket No. 12 at 6, or a stay of proceedings, *id.* at 4.

1 a new stipulated discovery plan addressing how the motion affects discovery, which must be filed
2 by February 28, 2025.

3 Pending also before the Court is the parties' proposed protective order. Docket No. 195.
4 In light of the above circumstances, the Court **DENIES** without prejudice the parties' proposed
5 protective order. *Id.*

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: January 31, 2025

8 
9 Nancy J. Koppe
United States Magistrate Judge

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28